

IV. REMARKS

This document is being submitted in response to the Office Action dated May 06, 2005. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 9-16, and 18 currently stand as rejected, and claims 5-8, 17, 19, and 20 stand as objected to. In response to the present Office Action, claims 1, 4, 16, and 18 have been cancelled, and claims 2-3, 5, 10-15, 17, 19-20 have been amended. have been amended. In light of the amendments and remarks made herein, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims.

Drawings

On page 2 of the present Office Action, the Patent Office identified several issues relating to the formal drawings. Replacement sheets for FIGS. 2 and 3B, which address these issues are submitted herewith.

Abstract

On page 2 of the present Office Action, the Patent Office indicated that the length of the Abstract is unacceptable. Accordingly, a substitute Abstract has been provided in Section III, above.

Specification

On page 2 of the present Office Action, the Patent Office indicated that two corrections to the Specification are required. Accordingly, two substitute paragraphs have been provided in Section III, above. Additionally, the first paragraph of the Summary of Invention section of the specification has been amended.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 16 of the present Office Action, the Patent Office indicated that claim 5-8, 17, and 19-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, independent claim 5 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 1 and 4, independent claim 17 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 9 and 16, and independent claim 19 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 18. All of the remaining dependent claims are not intervening claims, but rather dependent claims of the amended independent claims. Thus, the Applicant asserts that


because new independent claims are patentable over the cited references, that all of these dependent claims are also patentable.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth herein, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, as the claims are believed to define patentably over the relevant prior art. Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 07, 2005


Courtney J. Miller
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,366
Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP
1100 Fifth Third Center
21 East State Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 621-7015